

PROPOSAL RATING AND RANKING SUMMARY

PROJECT DEFINITION
 3 DECEMBER 2009

Rating Summary

The Department received three strong proposals in response to the RFP. All three proposals include significant corridor improvements that meet or exceed the Project's goals, values and requirements. The following common proposal elements are examples supporting this assessment:

- Providing the full build-out of the UIC width from American Fork Main Street through Provo Center Street
- Providing corridor improvements for the mainline and interchanges that accommodate 2030 traffic demands south of University Avenue through Spanish Fork Main Street, including additional mainline lanes and improved interchanges.
- Replacement of all existing bridges (except at I/C's not reconstructed) from American Fork Main Street through Provo Center Street
- Provision of mainline and ramp pavement with at least a 30 year design life between American Fork and Provo Center Street
- Provision of a complete drainage system through the extent of the proposed Work
- Completion of the Express Lane system through US 6, including ETC infrastructure
- Completion of the ATMS system through US 6.

The Project Definition evaluation team evaluated each of the proposals to assess the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal for each evaluation criterion listed in Section 4.5.1 "Provide the Highest Value for the Budget – Project Definition" in the Instructions to Proposers. The noted strengths and weakness were then evaluated against the project goals, values and requirements to determine an adjectival rating for the High, Medium and Low categories. The following is a summary of the adjectival ratings for each proposer in each criteria group that resulted from this effort:

Criteria Group	Flatiron Skanska Zachry (FSZ)	Provo River Constructors (PRC)	Timpanogos Transportation Constructors (TTC)
High	Exceptional	Exceptional	Very Good
Medium	Exceptional	Exceptional	Good
Low	Very Good	Very Good	Good

These ratings are supported by the attached Strengths and Weaknesses tables.

Rating Summary with Ranking

High Criteria Group – FSZ ranked No. 1

The proposals from both FSZ and PRC received an Exceptional adjectival rating in the High Criteria Group.

However, from the perspective of the Project Definition Team, the FSZ proposal implements improvements that are of a type and magnitude that exceed the project's goals, values and requirements to a greater extent. We believe that there is a significant difference between the proposals in the High criteria group for the following reasons:

- FSZ's proposed improvements to the University Parkway I/C, Sandhill Road I/S complex significantly outweigh PRC's proposed improvements to those intersections. FSZ's proposed improvements to the Provo Center Street I/C provide a better solution for Draper Lane access to Provo Center Street than that proposed by PRC while still providing interchange LOS C vs. the required D.
 - FSZ's proposed improvements to the University Parkway I/C and Sandhill Road I/S complex will perform significantly better than required (LOS C vs. LOS D) at 2020 traffic volumes. This interchange has 35% greater peak hour demands on it than any other interchange in Utah County. Incremental LOS improvements from D to C have a substantial impact on local and regional mobility including keeping ramp queuing from extending onto the mainline at 2020. This is a full LOS level better than the University Parkway I/C and Sandhill Road I/S complex proposed by PRC.
 - FSZ's proposed improvements to the Provo Center Street I/C will perform significantly better than required (LOS C or better vs. LOS D) at 2030 traffic volumes. While the PRC proposed Provo Center Street I/C functions at free flow (LOS A from a stop or signal control perspective), from the perspective of density and weaving it functions at LOS C at 2030 traffic volumes. I/C performance is very similar to the FSZ proposal at this I/C. We also note that the peak hour demand on this I/C is 40% less than the demand on University Parkway I/C. Therefore, any incremental difference in the LOS provided by the FSZ and PRC I/C alternatives at 2030 traffic volumes will not result in a noticeable difference in local or regional mobility. Also, the FSZ solutions for minor movements such as I-15 SB to Provo Center Street WB, and access to and from Draper Lane with direct access to Provo Center Street are better than the solution proposed by PRC.
- The investment in an additional auxiliary lane NB between Orem 1600 N and Pleasant Grove Blvd impacts significantly more traffic, and has a greater positive influence on relieving mainline congestion, than the location chosen by PRC. The implementation of this additional investment at this location includes the commitment to provide a wider mainline bridge and lengthen two bridges crossing I-15, thus simplifying future improvements.
- The construction of Express Lane direct accesses I/C's at Orem 400 N and at approximately Orem 1400 S with Park & Ride and access to Sandhill Road will reduce mainline traffic weaving to and from the exit ramps and the express lanes. They will also encourage greater utilization of the express lane and the ETC system which will reduce demand on the mainline general purpose lanes extending the life of the corridor. Based on the fact that other P&R lots in the corridor are fully utilized, the P&R lot associated with this proposal will facilitate positive mobility behavior changes that are beneficial to I-15 mainline

performance. The risk of not being able to implement one or both of these I/C is assessed as low to medium-low based on comments from FHWA regarding precedence and retroflexion on the I-15 EIS process.

Medium Criteria Group – FSZ ranked No. 1

The proposals from both FSZ and PRC received an Exceptional adjectival rating in the Medium Criteria Group. From the perspective of the Project Definition Team both proposals implement improvements of a type and magnitude that have essentially the same in impact. However, we believe that in aggregate the FSZ proposal is slightly better than the PRC proposal in the Medium criteria group for the following reasons:

- Improvements to I-15 and I-15 corridor operations from permanent MOT investments in Geneva Road improvements, including new bridge over the RR and improvements to all legs of 7 intersections. Including the Geneva Road permanent improvements as part of this project will help ensure that the planned benefits to I-15 actually occur sooner than later. It will also significantly improve the ability to coordinate the work and manage the impacts of the concurrent construction.
- Nine additional intersections are improved over the amount of intersections proposed by PRC. The intersections were generally improved to a higher level, typically by adding lanes. For example, all three proposals for reconstruction of the US6 interchange will remove and not replace the current the US6 to Spanish Fork Main Street movement that is available today. The FAZ proposal provides additional improvements at US6 and Chappel Drive to better accommodate this lost movement as well as providing a better transition for the US6 EB traffic back to the existing lanes east of the Chappel Drive intersection.

Low Criteria Group – FSZ ranked No. 1

The proposals from both FSZ and PRC received a very good adjectival rating in the Low Criteria Group. However, from the perspective of the Project Definition Team the FSZ proposal implements improvements of a type and magnitude that exceed the project's goals, values and requirements to a greater extent. We believe that there is a noticeable difference between the proposals in the Low criteria group for the following reasons:

- The proposed University Parkway I/C and Sandhill Road I/S complex functions at LOS D at 2030 traffic volumes, 10 years beyond the requirement. The proposed concept is based on the contractual 2030 traffic volumes and does not include any positive influences that the proposed Express Lane Direct Accesses may have. At 2030 this I/C delivers approximately 910 vehicles per lane to University Parkway at 400 W, a good match with the University Parkway's existing capacity.
- Implementation of the proposed Express Lane direct access interchanges would reduce traffic volumes at nearby interchanges below the contractual 2030 traffic volumes resulting in additional years of operation at suitable LOS.
- Improvements to University Parkway include an additional lane in each direction through the Sandhill Road intersection to approximately 1500 feet east of that intersection. This includes the ramp for the free flow movement from WB University Parkway to NB I-15 which starts approximately 1400 feet east of the intersection. These additional lanes and grade separations significantly improve the intersection

performance and facilitates matching the interchange and arterial capacities thereby solidifying their positive impact on the University Parkway interchange.

- High use of concrete bridges for replacement and new bridges reduces the need for future maintenance. FSZ uses 2 steel bridges. PRC uses 13 steel bridges.

Project Definition evaluation team:

Dan Dixon, Chair

Shane Marshall

Laura Smith

Laren Livingston

Brian Atkinson

John Butterfield, Pavement

Mike Dobry, Structures

Luis Porrello, Regional Mobility (Traffic)